

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-6411

LIONELL ELIJAH EPHRAIM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE, Director of the Department of Corrections, in his individual and official capacities; GENE JOHNSON, Deputy Director of the Department of Corrections, in his individual and official capacities; W. P. ROGERS, Regional Director of the Department of Corrections, in his individual and official capacities; CEI LOUIS, Chairman of the Central Classification Board (CCB), in his individual and official capacities; DUNCAN MILLS, Manager of the Central Classification Board (CCB), in his individual and official capacities; C. D. LARSEN, Warden of Lunenburg Correctional Center, in his individual and official capacities; DAVID L. GRAHAM, Assistant Warden of Operations, Lunenburg Correctional center, in his individual and official capacities; D. SPENCER, Human Rights Advocate, Lunenburg Correctional Center, in his individual and official capacities,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (VDOC),

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (CA-01-610-2)

Submitted: June 19, 2003

Decided: June 27, 2003

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lionell Elijah Ephraim, Appellant Pro Se. William W. Muse, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Lionell Elijah Ephraim appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Ephraim v. Angelone, No. CA-01-610-2 (E.D. Va. filed Mar. 1, 2003; entered Mar. 3, 2003).^{*} We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Because we have received and reviewed the district court record on appeal, we deny Ephraim's motion for transmittal of the record as unnecessary.